

The ESEA flexibility waiver provides several options for state in setting AMO's. New Hampshire has chosen Option A. Option A sets AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the "all students" group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The SEA must use current proficiency rates based on assessments administered in the 2011–2012 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.

However, it is the state's intention to smoothly transition to the assessments developed by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) in 2015 as well as the complex performance assessments in subsequent years as they come online.

The tables 8-11 below demonstrate using the state's current NECAP summative assessment performance with Option A by subgroup and whole school (the state is the school in this example) in Reading and Mathematics. The baseline data starts with 2011-12 school year and ends six years later in 2016-17.

Table 8

	NECAP Reading Index Scores (Elem/Middle Schools)					
Student Group	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Whole State	91.7	92.5	93.4	94.2	95.0	95.9
Hispanic	83.4	85.1	86.7	88.4	90.0	91.7
Native American	87.2	88.5	89.8	91.0	92.3	93.6
Asian/PI	92.7	93.4	94.2	94.9	95.6	96.4
African American	83.6	85.2	86.9	88.5	90.2	91.8
White	92.3	93.1	93.8	94.6	95.4	96.2
Ed. Disadvantage	85.0	86.5	88.0	89.5	91.0	92.5
SWD	71.5	74.4	77.2	80.1	82.9	85.8
ELL	76.9	79.2	81.5	83.8	86.1	88.5

Table 9

	NECAP Math Index Scores (Elem/Middle Schools)					
Student Group	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Whole State	87.4	88.7	89.9	91.2	92.4	93.7
Hispanic	74.8	77.3	79.8	82.4	84.9	87.4
Native American	80.9	82.8	84.7	86.6	88.5	90.5
Asian/PI	90.4	91.4	92.3	93.3	94.2	95.2
African American	71.6	74.4	77.3	80.1	83.0	85.8
White	88.3	89.5	90.6	91.8	93.0	94.2
Ed. Disadvantage	78.1	80.3	82.5	84.7	86.9	89.1
SWD	62.5	66.3	70.0	73.8	77.5	81.3
ELL	69.7	72.7	75.8	78.8	81.8	84.9

Table 10

	NECAP Reading Index Scores (High School)					
Student Group	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Whole State	90.4	91.4	92.3	93.3	94.2	95.2
Hispanic	80.1	82.1	84.1	86.1	88.1	90.1
Native American	88.7	89.8	91.0	92.1	93.2	94.4
Asian/PI	90.2	91.2	92.2	93.1	94.1	95.1
African American	83.6	85.2	86.9	88.5	90.2	91.8
White	90.9	91.8	92.7	93.6	94.5	95.5
Ed. Disadvantage	82.0	83.8	85.6	87.4	89.2	91.0
SWD	69.2	72.3	75.4	78.4	81.5	84.6
ELL	68.8	71.9	75.0	78.2	81.3	84.4

Table 11

	NECAP Math Index Scores (High School)					
Student Group	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Whole State	67.2	70.5	73.8	77.0	80.3	83.6
Hispanic	48.2	53.4	58.6	63.7	68.9	74.1
Native American	56.8	61.1	65.4	69.8	74.1	78.4
Asian/PI	73.9	76.5	79.1	81.7	84.3	87.0
African American	49.8	54.8	59.8	64.9	69.9	74.9
White	68.0	71.2	74.4	77.6	80.8	84.0
Ed. Disadvantage	52.6	57.3	62.1	66.8	71.6	76.3
SWD	37.0	43.3	49.6	55.9	62.2	68.5
ELL	40.0	46.0	52.0	58.0	64.0	70.0

The tables above represent the AMOs for the whole state. In practice, these AMOs will be calculated for each subgroup in each New Hampshire school based on the 2011-2012 achievement of the student groups in each school. The AMOs are represented using New Hampshire's previously approved index system (described below). NHDOE will continue to use its approved "n" size of 11 students for testing purposes with a waiver approval. All available student achievement data for the most recent four years— using NECAP — for the "all students" group is reviewed for each school annually. The raw student achievement data for the state's reading and mathematics assessments is converted to a 100-point index score. The index scores in each content area for the "all students" group are added together for each school in order to produce an annual combined score. The annual combined scores are then totaled to produce a cumulative achievement score for each school. These score serve as the foundation for designating Reward, Priority and Focus Schools

New Hampshire has created a system of measuring and documenting the performance of student subgroups that maximizes the validity of the accountability system by holding more schools accountable for subgroup performance than would be the case under a traditional NCLB definition of subgroups. Additionally, students are counted once in this system, which subsequently presents a more accurate and fair representation of students needs at a school or district. Identifying students in this manner gives educators at the local and state level, the information needed to develop the most effective educational environment while permitting detailed assessment and reporting.

The New Hampshire system is focused on the educational needs of students in the three major subgroups in New Hampshire – economically disadvantaged, special education, and English learners, as well as students in multiple subgroups. Because of New Hampshire’s relatively homogeneous student population, these subgroups of students collectively address the needs of essentially all underperforming students in New Hampshire. Different than many “super-subgroup” systems, the New Hampshire system recognizes that students in multiple subgroups may have different learning needs than students in a single subgroup and therefore, evaluates the performance of students in multiple subgroups if applicable.

From a practical standpoint, there still will be some schools that do not meet the reporting requirement of eleven students. In those cases, student counts will be aggregated across multiple subgroup categories. This would allow smaller enrollment schools to locally identify the particular needs of students and meet NHDOE reporting requirements once number thresholds are achieved. In this way, student needs are continuously identified and made the priority at the school level.

Safeguards of the new categorization system are demonstrated below (**Table 12**) using actual school data. The first column, “Previous Categories vs. New Categories” identifies previous (under the State’s Adequacy Accountability System) and the newly created categories used to identify student subgroups. The second column “Actual Student Summed Enrollment” represents the total number of students present in each of the previous and newly created categories. Subsequently, the reader can review that the same number of students is depicted in both the previous and new categorization systems.

The columns, “Comparative Analysis: Summed IEP Enrollment” and “Comparative Analysis: Summed SES Enrollment”, provide an example, using the IEP and SES subgroups, of how students are more appropriately and effectively accounted for using the new categorization system. This is especially evidenced by comparing the SES enrollment column. Under the previous system, 585 of the 907 district-wide students could be accounted for but there was no way of discerning the subgroup where the additional 322 were located. The new categorization system prevents this by assigning a unique categorical identifier to each student’s circumstances. With this new system, it is impossible to mask or multiple-count student’s membership in any sub-group.

Table 12

Previous Categories vs. New Categories	Actual Student Summed Enrollment	Comparative Analysis: Summed IEP Enrollment	Comparative Analysis: Summed SES Enrollment
Previous: AllOtherSG	2733		
Previous: SESSG	585		585
Previous: IEP SG	719	719	
Previous: EL	90		
Previous: ELComp \geq 4	49		
Total Across all SES	907		585
Total Across All IEP	736	719	
New: IEP	440	440	
New: LEP	38		
New: LEP & IEP	9	9	
New: LEP & SES	35		35
New: LEP & SES & IEP	8	8	8
New: SES	585		585
New: SES & IEP	279	279	279
New: All Other students	2733		
Total		736	907

In an effort to develop a fair, meaningful and flexible AMO system as part of New Hampshire's ESEA Flexibility Waiver, a "Risk Corridor" was created. A Risk Corridor is calculated for each school and sub-group which provides a margin for acceptable AMO performance. A school is considered to be in the Risk Corridor when they are below the actual target, but are within 5% of the target, or within the -95% confidence interval - whichever is a smaller number. Schools determined to be in the Risk Corridor are considered to have made AMO, but should be aware that they did not meet their target and may want to make adjustments during the next year. Schools below the Risk Corridor have not made AMO and are considered to be at "High Risk.